

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are currently pending. Applicants have elected not to amend the claims.

Claims 1-2, 8-10, 13, 15-16, 18-22, 24-25, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shah et al. (U. S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0078893).

Claims 3-7, 11-12, 14, 17, 23, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah in view of Paul Austin (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200280).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of each of the pending claims. Specifically, Shah fails to anticipate claim 1 as Shah fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1. Specifically, Shaw, as understood, discusses a postage metering system where postage is purchased and sent from a remote postage printing system (RPPD) to a secure metering device (SMD) via a wireless communication link. See the abstract of Shah. The wireless communication link is described in the application as a cellular link, terrestrial link, a satellite link, an RF link, an infrared link, or a microwave link. See Shah at paragraph 34 among other locations. Nowhere does Shah ever describe the link as being an Internet link. As Shaw fails entirely to discuss communication via the Internet or the like, Shaw fails entirely to disclose that a postage indicium is received in a markup language message used for Internet communications. For at least this reason Shah fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, Shah fails to anticipate claim 1.

Shah fails to anticipate claim 10 as Shah fails entirely to discuss receiving a stamp over the Internet or the like and therefore fails to disclose transferring the stamp in a language configured for sending information over the Internet, such as extensible mark up language (XML). As Shah fails entirely to discuss sending stamps via XML, Shah fails to disclose every limitation of claim 10. Therefore, Shah fails to anticipate claim 10.

Appl. No. 09/902,479
Amdt. dated December 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

PATENT

Claim 22 recites similar limitations to those of claim 10 distinguished from Shah above. Therefore, for at least the same reasons that Shah fails to anticipate claim 10, Shah similarly fails to anticipate claim 22.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL
60663834 v1